

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/533,286

Applicant(s)

OKAICHI ET AL.

Examiner

Theresa Trieu

Art Unit

3748

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Theresa Trieu. (3) _____

(2) Nicholas Bromer (Reg. No.: 33,478). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 August 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 23 and 26.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ozu et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,782,622); Arai et al. (Publication Number JP 56-165788); Hashimoto (Publication Number JP 01-253386).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


THERESA TRIEU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants presented arguments that the any one of the prior art Ozu '622 or Arai '788 or Hashimoto '386 fails to show a porous member is between the compressor and motor and the porous plate having holes. However, the claims as written is not specific to such a limitation. Claims 23 and 26 will be amended to positively recite limitations directed to the position of the porous member related to the upper bearing between the compression mechanism and the rotational motor. The applicants will amend the drawing with the limitation of the size of the diameter of the hole at the center and outer peripheral of the porous plate. Claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 will be canceled. The amended claims will be reconsidered when formally submitted.

*The Applicant has not yet
decided how to respond.*

*Nick Brommer
33,478*